



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

disorder of those constructed by its critics. When this is found, the history of Athens for the early third century may be entirely rewritten.

From 295 to 262 B.C. the succession of political parties at Athens in control of the government is most bewildering. Mr. Ferguson outlines the various changes as follows. First there was a coalition government which gradually became anti-Demetrian, but was saved from going too far by the recall of the exiles. In 290 B.C. the city was thoroughly pro-Demetrian, changing in the following year to an extreme democracy affiliated with Lysimachus and Ptolemy. The situation at Athens after the death of Lysimachus is not clearly defined, but apparently the city was independent with Seleucid affiliations while Phaedrus, a moderate pro-Antigonid, was in a position of trust and influence. Phaedrus was followed by Glaucon and Chremonides, seemingly moderate at this time, and only later becoming extremists of the democratic party. In 276 a limited democracy friendly to Antigonos came into power. In 274 Athens was neutral, friendly to Pyrrhus and Antigonos. In the following year the radical democrats subsidized by Egypt became prominent though they did not dominate the state, and we have the remarkable picture of a pro-Macedonian and pro-Egyptian party living in apparent amity for some six or seven years. In 266 Athens definitely cast in her lot with Ptolemy and asserted her independence of Macedon. This act precipitated the Chremonidean war and for five years Athens strove to beat back the armies of Antigonos. In March 261 B.C. the city surrendered to the invader and for a generation was a part of the kingdom of Macedon. In the midst of all this turmoil of change any one seeking for an explanation of disturbances of the secretary-cycle should find difficulty only in selection.

In the years which followed the Chremonidean War Athens was transformed from a city-state to a municipality of the empire of Macedon. A certain measure of democracy was granted after 256 B.C. but the public assemblies no longer controlled the destinies of the people. Athens naturally took no part in the development of the various leagues and federations which were becoming so important a political factor in Greece. From 261 to 229 B. C. the main interest is centered in the history of these various federations and the struggle for the supremacy of the Aegean between Antigonos and Ptolemy. During these years the prominence of the philosophic schools at Athens compensated in some degree for her loss of political power.

When Athens gained her independence, her foreign policies were directed by Eurycleides and Micion, who established friendly relations with all the Mediterranean nations. In the second century the fidelity of the democracy to Rome, which established a virtual protectorate over the city, won in return for Athens a long era of peace and the restoration of part of her

ancient empire. In this new empire, if we can call it such, the center of political interest shifts from the mother-state to the chief dependency, the island of Delos.

The destruction of Corinth and the extension of Roman interests in Asia led to an extraordinary development of Delos as a trade center. The island far surpassed the mother state in economic importance and the administration of the affairs of this colonial possession became the most vital political problem in Athens. Gradually, however, Roman influence encroached upon Athenian, and the control of the government finally passed into the hands of the Italian settlers on the island. When Corinth was rebuilt new trade routes were established and the decline of Delos was as sudden as its rise.

While the administration of the affairs of Delos brought its problems, the development of religious and philosophic thought seems to have been the most vital matter in Athenian life. In the last century of the Pre-Christian era the Areopagus regained some of its old powers, and other constitutional changes were made. The prevailing note of the first quarter of this century is the gradual encroachment of Rome, and the growth of a party which resented her assertions and aspired to independence. The success of Mithridates won the people over to the side of the nationalist party and, when the king promised his assistance, they definitely declared against Rome. The wretched story of the siege of Athens by Sulla and his treatment of the city on its surrender is well known. Henceforward Athens was only a little University town in a great empire.

Such is a brief summary of the book. Any criticism of minor points is overshadowed by the evidence on every hand of sound scholarship and careful research. The numerous footnotes show plainly how thoroughly the author was conversant with everything which concerned his work, and, even if we may disagree with the author's interpretation of certain periods, we are confident that all historians who venture into this field must first reckon with Mr. Ferguson's account of Hellenistic Athens.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

Athens, The Violet-Crowned. By Lilian Whiting. Boston: Little, Brown and Company (1913). Pp. xii + 361. \$2.50.

This is a beautiful book, beautifully printed and beautifully bound, with an excellent illustration of the Parthenon on the outside and with thirty-six fine plates from photographs inside. The author is a well-known Boston lady, who has written some twenty other books, including works on Boston, Florence, Italy, Paris, and the Brownings. She has evidently spent some time in Athens; indeed, she wrote this book in Athens. She knows the names of many archaeologists, such as Schliemann and Waldstein, from both of whom, but

especially from the latter, she quotes much—often inexactly.

It is evident that Miss Whiting is no archaeologist, and it would not be worth while to review her book for *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, if it did not contain some very amusing errors, which should be recorded along with the interesting philological mistakes which students make in their translation of Latin and Greek.

One page (79), with regard to the sculptures of the Parthenon, is a classic. According to this, it would seem that the Venus of Melos, the Victory of Samothrace, the Phigalean frieze, the Harpy tomb, and many other sculptures came from the Parthenon, together with a metope from Selinus in Palermo, which is ascribed to Silenus—a new Greek sculptor, as interesting as the sculptor Kallipygos created by the late Professor Eaton of Yale in his abridged translation of Friedrich's Bausteine, and as the painter Attalus created by Miss Weir in her Greek Painter's Art (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 1.230), or as the sculptor Milo suggested by the tourist looking at the Venus di Milo.

Let me point out a few of the many other errors¹. I shall confine myself in the main to errors touching classical matters. On pages 12, 66, 182, 343, 344 Delphi is confused with the capital of India and so is called Delhi. On page 42 the Olympieum is said to have been founded by Pisistratus about 530 B.C., completed by Hadrian, and consecrated four hundred years after its beginning. That would put Hadrian's visit in 130 B.C. instead of 130 A.D. On page 55 occurs the remarkable mistake of putting the Tower of the Winds in the region of the monument of Lysicrates. How could anyone who has been in Athens make such a statement? The tower is twenty-six feet in diameter, not twenty-seven in circumference; it was not surmounted by eight figures, and Andronicus the builder came from Cyrrhus in Syria, not from Cyrrhus in Macedonia. On page 60 Theseus is called a god, and the temple of Theseus (wrongly so called) is characterized as the purest example of the Doric design (nothing is said about the Parthenon). The roof of the temple is not intact, as the author states, but has been replaced by a barrel-vault. On page 63, while Miss Whiting admits that "the severest of the archaeologists hold a doubt as to whether" the so-called prison of Socrates is the actual scene of his imprisonment, she is certain that she has beheld there the very spot of that imprisonment. Nearly, if not quite all, archaeologists hold that this is not a prison but part of an ancient two-story house. On page 66 we are told that the National Museum is not interesting, not the usual verdict, even of tourists, and Miss Whiting herself admits elsewhere that Dr. Schliemann's collection of Mycenaean antiquities, by which she seems to mean the Mycenaean room in the National Museum, is of

interest. Nor does Miss Whiting know that Greece is full of important local museums, as at Sparta, Corinth, Epidaurus, Chaeronea, Volo, etc. On page 68 we have Socrates buried in the Dipylon, and "here is pointed out the tomb of Pericles, now in process of excavation, and of Euripides". Who pointed these out to Miss Whiting? No archaeologist has seen them, so far as I know. Pages 92–93 are almost as delightful as page 79. Here we learn that the seats of the theater, which is called an amphitheater, are marble chairs rising tier above tier, where two thousand spectators could listen to the masterpieces of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. There were only two marble tiers, and the theater would seat about 17,000; and the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles could not have been played in this stone theater, which was not erected till about 330 B.C. We learn that "the theater was decorated, in the days of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes, with statues of the leading tragic and comic poets, the pediments of which are still intact and bear the names of the poets represented". This is not true of Aeschylus, and pediments cannot be used for pedestals. We learn (93) that even the diminutive stage still exists, supported by sculptures of the days of Aeschylus and Euripides; but the stage preserved belongs to the third century A.D., and the sculptures date from the early Roman Empire. On page 136 it is stated that four different sets of people occupied Hissarlik, the site of Troy, and Schliemann's theory is adopted that the second nation was the Homeric Trojans, whereas in truth there were nine strata, and the sixth stratum was the Homeric city. On pages 144, 146, 153, we have the extraordinary error of transference of the Lion Gate (which is said to establish the fact that there was an Agamemnon) from Mycenae to Tiryns. On page 230 we read that Theocritus is "peculiarly difficult to fairly represent, as out of his Idyls only some thirty fragments survive". On page 251 we are told that "On Ithaca all the sites of the Odyssey are absolutely discovered, according to the convictions of the discoverers, who, being Dr. Schliemann and Sir William Gell, hold undisputed authority; even the stone looms used by the nymphs are in actual existence, so one's illusions need not be drawn upon there; reality may be substituted". Surely all the sites of the Odyssey are not located on Ithaca, and what about Dörpfeld's theory that Leukas is Ithaca? In connection with Olympia we have mentioned (344) the Vale of Tempe and Mt. Olympus, and the statement that the utter desolation of the mountainous solitudes about Olympia makes it easy to believe that only the gods could inhabit them. "On this Olympian height all human vision was quickened and purified" (345). "Leaving this wonderful place, descending the mountain again, one feels that the great god Pan is left behind" (346). How can one who has travelled in Greece possibly confuse Olympia in the plain of Elis with Mt. Olympus in Thessaly, although I heard a well-known minister make the same mistake the

¹There is no space to note the innumerable misprints, especially in proper names, such as "Phoenician" for 'Phaeacian' (103, 248), "Socrates" for 'Sophocles' (350), etc.

other day in a public sermon? Moreover the altar of Zeus at Olympia is not the altar of Zeus (346), but prehistoric elliptical houses, nor are there any remains of a palace of Nero (346).

There are very many more errors than those I have mentioned, but these are enough to show how inaccurate the book is. To the man who knows something about Greece, however, the book will be worth its price, for the reader will get two dollars and a half worth of fun and pleasure out of it; and we must remember that the author herself says (63) that she is "not an archaeologist, or a person in any way inconveniently encumbered with learning". As she says, "a too great doubting capacity is eminently unsuited to extracting the greatest possible amount of pleasure and interest out of one's transatlantic wanderings", and too much learning has certainly not been a drawback to Miss Whiting's enjoyment in antiquities. On page 249 she says that an encyclopedia and an atlas will supply knowledge anywhere, but to get the most out of one's saunterings one wants to believe in the impossible. We must reply that no encyclopedia furnishes sufficient knowledge about Athens and Greece to enable one to write an accurate book on the subject, but we must confess that the author believes in the impossible. Let no one, moreover, think that this book, full of quotation and repetition, confines itself to Athens, as a list of the chapters will show: Athens, the Violet-Crowned, Saunterings and Surprises, The Acropolis, The Eleusinian Mysteries, The Story of Dr. Schliemann (with much quotations from his works), The Archaeological Schools in Athens, Greek Sculpture and Philosophy, Contemporary Literature in Greece, Ethical Poetry of Greece, The Charm of Corfu, The Royal Family of Greece (a very good chapter), The Progress of Greece, The First Century of Greek Independence.

This reviewer is not eager to deprive the inoffensive tourist of his legitimate joys, but it is written with the firm belief that even the ordinary layman, to say nothing of the visitor to Athens, prefers not to be misinformed.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. DAVID M. ROBINSON.

The Latin Ladder. By Robert W. Tunstall. New York: The Macmillan Company (1913). Pp. xiv+290. Five illustrations and map. 90 cents, net.

To the many 'Gates', 'Bridges', 'Straight Roads' to Caesar, and other seductive short-cuts to the desired knowledge of Latin which have appeared in recent years is added now The Latin Ladder, by Mr. Robert W. Tunstall, of the Tome School for Boys, at Port Deposit, Maryland.

In a novel preface, which consists in part of quotations from various classical worthies, Mr. Tunstall lays down his articles of faith: (1) that the work of the first year in Latin is the most important in all the preparatory course; (2) that the paramount matter in the first year is inflection; (3) that inflection is

best taught by emphasizing from the beginning the significance of stem and ending; (4) that inherent interest in the subject-matter must be stimulated by the reading lessons which reward the beginner for his preparatory toil.

To accomplish these ends, which do not differ so very much from the aims of most beginners' books, the Ladder is divided into three parts. Part I, intended to "orient" the pupil, contains the following material, developed very slowly, and spread thin over twenty-one lessons: (1) the indicative active and passive of the four conjugations (including deponent verbs), and the indicative of *sum*—all in the third person only; (2) nouns of the first and simpler nouns of the second declension, together with adjectives similarly inflected: also an introduction to the third declension; (3) three pronouns used in three cases only; (4) a few common prepositions treated in some detail; (5) a chapter on the order of words in Latin, with illustrative selections for reading; and (6), at the end of Part I, a summary of the fifteen rules of syntax employed in the preceding lessons.

Part II, the main body of the book, presents forms and syntax in alternate chapters. In the chapters on syntax, questions leading up to the composition work and followed by illustrative sentences in Latin form a catechism on the principles given in Part III. Every fifth chapter in Part II is a reading lesson. Every seventh chapter is followed by a series of review questions. The reading lessons throughout the book consists of continuous narrative, and in Part II are based on *Viri Romae* and the Helvetian War.

Part III contains a systematic presentation of the principles of syntax, to be used for reference in Part II, and for convenience in review work if needed. This forms a valuable addition to the main body of the book and contains several excellent chapters, especially those treating of the gerund and the gerundive and indirect discourse. The Latin examples, as well as the sentences for translation, are in general well chosen. The illustration given for the genitive is, perhaps, an exception to the rule, being really a genitive of material.

The vocabularies are chosen with great care from Professor Lodge's book, *The Vocabulary of High School Latin*. Vocabulary reviews come at regular intervals throughout the book, with a final word-list of five hundred and three words to be mastered.

On the whole the Ladder contains much that is pleasing. The slow development of the earlier lessons will doubtless be a boon to many, and the great amount of explanation, generally left to the teacher, will be a blessing to the inexperienced or the poorly equipped. The resulting irregularity in the length of chapters, which vary from a page and a half to nine pages, might be objected to, but the chapters are punctuated by exercises at fairly regular intervals, so that they may be divided into lessons of average length. Another result of the unusually large amount of explanatory matter is a certain crowded appearance